DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 152 216 HE 009 813

TITLE	The Maintenance of Academic Quality in a Time of Uncertainty. Proceedings of a National Seminar Held in Keystone, Colorado, July 18-20, 1977.
INSTITUTION	Education Commission of the States, Denver, Colo.; State Higher Education Executive Officers Association.
SPONS AGENCY	Kellogg Foundation, Battle Creek, Mich.
PUB DATE	Jul 77
NOTE	71p.
AVAILABLE FROM	Education Commission of the States, Inservice Education Program, 1860 Lincoln Street, Suite 300, Denver, Colorado 80295
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.83 HC-$3.50 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Academic Standards; *Conference Reports; Educational Planning; *Educational Quality; Financial Support; Political Influences; Seminars; Staff Role; State Aid; *State Boards of Education; State Officials; *Statewide Planning; Student Financial Aid

ABSTRACT

The proceedings of the Inservice Education Program seminar for statewide academic planning and program review officers in state boards of education are summarized. Areas discussed during the sessions and summarized here include: (1) student aid vs. institutional aid; (2) current issues in state planning; (3) differentiation of function; (4) the question of quality; (5) the need for comprehensive state planning; (6) the politics of planning; and (7) the purposes, criteria, processes and powers of program review. The appendices contain papers on varying definitions of academic quality and the numerous trends and pressures threatening to its pursuit (George W. Bonham); and practical and political circumstances confronting statewide education boards (Richard M. Millard). A list of other papers presented and a list of attendees are also provided. (SPG)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED152216

PROCEEDINGS

The Maintenance of Academic Quality In a Time of Uncertainty

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

ECS

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

INSERVICE EDUCATION PROGRAM
of the
EDUCATION COMMISSION of the STATES
1860 Lincoln Street
Suite 300
Denver, Colorado 80295

HE009813

July 18-20, 1977
Keystone Lodge
Keystone, Colorado

PROCEEDINGS

THE MAINTENANCE OF ACADEMIC QUALITY IN A TIME OF UNCERTAINTY

A National Seminar
Sponsored by

The Inservice Education Program
of the
Education Commission of the States
and by the
State Higher Education Executive Officers Association

July 18-20, 1977
Keystone Lodge
Keystone, Colorado

The Inservice Education Program of ECS is funded primarily by a five-year grant from the W. K. Kellogg Foundation, with additional funds from ECS, SHEEO, and meeting registration fees.

Inservice Education Program of the
Education Commission of the States
1860 Lincoln Street
Suite 300
Denver, Colorado 80295

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

I. THE NATURE OF THE CONFERENCE

II. THE BROADER SETTING FOR ACADEMIC PLANNING AND PROGRAM REVIEW

III. MAJOR ISSUES BEFORE THE STATE BOARDS

IV. CONCLUDING REMARKS

WARREN HILL

V. POSSIBLE FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS

ROBERT BERDAHL

APPENDICES

A. Program

B. The Maintenance of Academic Quality in a Time of Uncertainty
George W. Bonham

C. Issues of Statewide Concern in Higher Education
Richard M. Millard

D. Other Papers

E. List of Attendees

INTRODUCTION

State-level academic planners have an important role to play in the distribution of the educational resources of the state. The academic planner attempts to foster articulation among institutions, and, in most states, provides the organizational direction necessary to effectively monitor and review academic programs at the state-level. In order to carry out this mission, the academic planner needs the opportunity to exchange ideas with other professionals in the field. This seminar was one attempt to provide an opportunity for professional dialogue.

The following is a report on the proceedings of the Inservice Education Program Seminar, "The Maintenance of Academic Quality in a Time of Uncertainty." The conference arose out of a strongly felt desire of academic planning and program review officers in statewide boards of higher education to have a professional forum comparable to their senior State Higher Education Executive Officers. As a result, the conference brought together about 70 such officers from 34 states and three Canadian provinces. As a first meeting, the seminar's primary purpose was to create a network of statewide academic planning officers with shared concerns, and to identify and explore the nature of those concerns.

Many individuals combined their efforts to make the conference a success. Louis Rabineau, Director of the Inservice Education Program, ECS, was primarily responsible for putting together the conference. In planning and implementing it he collaborated most closely with Robert J. Barak, Director of Research and Information of the Iowa Board of Regents and with Robert W. Jacob, Assistant Commissioner for Academic Affairs, Missouri Department of Higher Education. Kenneth Fischer, Director of the Postsecondary Education Convening Authority, Institute for Education Leadership, and Harriet Hollander, Director of Counseling at Skidmore College, New York, served as process consultants. Robert O. Berdahl, professor of higher education, State University of New York at Buffalo and Amy Plumer, education reporter, observed the sessions and provided a summary of the conference proceedings.

Unfortunately, space does not allow for the reproductions of all the papers presented at the conference. The interested reader is referred to the appendix where he/she will find reference to additional resources that may be made available, upon request, from Education Commission of the States.

I. THE NATURE OF THE CONFERENCE

Hardly has the dust settled from the last three decades' extraordinary expansion of higher education, but those in positions at least partly responsible for its delivery and quality find themselves having to plan for its contraction. Before statewide academic planners are dual jobs: They have to monitor and provide articulation among institutions and programs -- some of which have only just been established -- while at the same time they have to plan for their total system's contraction. New ideas, new skills, new instruments are needed.

The following report on the proceedings of the Inservice Education Program seminar, "The Maintenance of Academic Quality in a Time of Uncertainty," is the second step in a needed process of communication. The seminar itself was the first step. Sponsored by SHEEO and the Inservice Education Program of the Education Commission of the States, it was held July 18-20, 1977, in Keystone, Colorado.

The conference arose out of a strongly felt desire of academic planning and program review officers in statewide boards of higher education to have a professional forum comparable to their senior SHEEO officers and it brought together about 70 such officers from 34 states and three Canadian provinces. The seminar's primary purpose, as a first meeting, were simply to create a network of statewide academic planning officers with shared concerns, and to identify and explore the nature of those concerns. The purpose of this report is to further the dialogue begun in Keystone by recording and commenting upon the problems and ideas voiced at the seminar, by reproducing or summarizing the papers delivered and by distributing the names, interests and areas of expertise of those in attendance.

Louis Rabineau, Director of the Inservice Education Program, ECS, was primarily responsible for putting together the conference. In planning and implementing it he collaborated most closely with Robert J. Barak, Director of Research and Information of the Iowa Board of Regents and with Robert W. Jacob, Assistant Commissioner for Academic Affairs, Missouri Department of Higher Education. Kenneth Fischer, Director of the Postsecondary Education Convening Authority, Institute for Education Leadership, and Harriet Hollander, Director of Counseling, Skidmore College, served as process consultants. Robert O. Berdahl, professor of higher education, State University of New York at Buffalo and Amy Plumer, education reporter, were asked to observe the sessions and produce this report.

It was agreed that this first meeting of the statewide academic planning and review officers should be devoted to establishing relations among professionals who shared concerns and to identifying broadly those concerns; it was not intended to provide a deep and intensive examination of only a few major issues. Thus the primary substance of the conference was found in the informal discussions which occurred in the 12 concurrent sessions, offered in four different sets. While resource persons were present in nearly all these sessions, the emphasis was on participants' sharing the problems and challenges with which they are currently struggling; what was sought were sharper definitions of common problems, new views of the interrelationships among these problems, and in some cases, identification of useful materials, bibliography and experiences.

Although broad ranging, dialogue essentially fell into three categories: A review and exploration of the new, complicated and potentially grim circumstances in which higher education finds itself during the closing

decades of the 20th Century; the novel planning, monitoring and mediating roles these new circumstances are foisting upon state-wide boards, many of which themselves are developing agencies; and the somewhat uncharted territory of conceptualizing and mounting program reviews.

II. THE BROADER SETTING FOR ACADEMIC PLANNING AND PROGRAM REVIEW

That state academic planners will be poor in the raw materials of higher education -- students and money -- but wealthy in intellectual, political and technical challenges in the years ahead was surely the consensus of the seminar. While most of the panel sessions focused on defining the problems planners were having in responding to these new challenges, the two keynote speakers, George W. Bonham, editor-in-chief of Change Magazine, and Richard M. Millard, director of post-secondary education at ECS, and resource person, Stephen Dresch, president, Institute for Demographic and Economic Studies, Yale University, dealt thoroughly, if variously, with contemporary trends affecting higher education and its management on the state level.

Before dealing with the discussions themselves, we will first summarize briefly the three above-mentioned papers to provide a feeling for the broader setting of the conference. All three papers are presented in their entirety later in this report.

Dr. Millard provided a comprehensive overview of the practical and political circumstances confronting statewide education boards; Dr. Bonham explored varying definitions of academic quality, identifying numerous trends and pressures threatening to its pursuit; and Dr. Dresch offered a gloomy view of the dynamics of growth and decline in higher education, quite in keeping with his "dismal science."

Dr. Millard enumerated six "changed conditions" which are providing a highly problemmatic framework for the functioning of statewide higher education boards. These were: -- changes in the student population: By 1985 the traditional college age group of 18-to-24-year olds is

anticipated to drop by 4.1 percent nationally; in some states it will drop by as much as 22.3 percent. Overall enrollments, depending on the prognosticator, are at best expected to hold even. At the same time the development of a new, nontraditional, older student clientele will require new institutional forms and modes of instruction and new kinds of statewide planning and monitoring. And new questions arise about whether the tax dollar should be devoted to adult, career-oriented education.

--changes in level of appropriation: Evolving public policies suggest a lower priority for higher education. Funding for higher education is expected at best to stay constant, more likely to decrease. Inflation and rising costs are hitting institutions as lowered confidence and competing public services are prevalent in state governments.

--changes in posture of public and state government: A growing concern for accountability is bringing to bear a new set of pressures and expectations for institutions and state boards. Management information systems, program budgeting, performance audits and program reviews are all occurring. Legislative or executive units in at least 20 states have mounted their own performance audits. Such audits, performed by non-education government agencies, pose a serious threat to the integrity of the academic process. Said Dr. Millard "Far too frequently...the prime criterion is likely to be efficiency rather than educational effectiveness."

--changes in conceptualization of higher education universe: A recognition is growing that public higher education is only one part of the

postsecondary universe. Planning will have to include private, proprietary, vocational/technical education and other efforts.

--changes in federal-state relations: Federal legislation and regulations are having an increasing impact on the work of statewide boards and it is critically important that state and federal programs be looked at and planned for in relation to each other.

--changes in attitudes towards governance: Legislatures and governors, in their heightened concern for accountability, are seeking to further centralize and control the operation of higher education. This is being expressed through the granting of greater powers to state governing boards, but there is also a trend for executive or legislative branches to take over directly the major functions of budget review, audit control or actual decision making.

These changed conditions, suggested Dr. Millard, are adding up to a major challenge to statewide boards, which themselves have been undergoing changes in the last few years. "The critical question may well be whether existing coordinating and governing structures are adequate to deal with the changing conditions, the unsteady state, and the time of uncertainty." Between 1970 and 1975, Dr. Millard pointed out, 23 states have modified their higher education agencies. During 1976, six states considered changes; one withdrew the budget development and review function; and another gave the legislature the power to determine institutional role and scope. Established to plan for orderly growth, boards are quite suddenly expected to manage decline. Of the phenomena in flux in the higher education world, the changing structure and expectations for performance of higher education state boards may be the most crucial, suggested Dr. Millard.

A somewhat jocular but nevertheless telling indication that participants were well aware of the changing conditions Dr. Millard outlined was offered by a lugubrious little questionnaire, entitled "Test for a State of Decline," distributed in a session by F. Gordon Foster, Associate Commissioner for Academic Affairs, South Dakota Board of Regents. The Questionnaire lists twelve, now common phenomena indicating a hostile public attitude toward higher education.

Another interesting presentation was Dr. Dresch's run-through of both external and internal forces that should result in at least the temporary decline of the higher education estate. Dr. Dresch argued that the forces which served to encourage growth in higher education have now turned around and are serving to limit it and produce a decline. The growth-producing forces -- technological and organizational changes in the society -- i.e., demand for a more highly skilled labor force and meritocratic ideals -- have resulted in a greater supply of highly educated labor than the market requires and have also resulted in a deterioration of competence in both student and faculty.

Decline will result then, he argued, from several causes. Sheer numbers will go down because of a lowered birthrate and a smaller proportion of college age students choosing college in response to a market glutted with highly but perhaps not very well educated persons. Decline in quality has already occurred because of the swift, mass production of Ph.Ds during the last few decades. It will decline further because of tenure policies that will lock in the less able faculty now teaching. By 1990, Dr. Dresch predicted, college enrollments will be 75 percent of their present size.

The trends Dr. Bonham explored in his attempt to define the setting in which state academic planners must function were of a different order. Dr. Bonham sought to define what was the nature of academic quality which state officers are charged with maintaining and what were the current forces leading to its flowering or fading. Although extending the boundaries of the definition of quality to include not only intellectual activity but also moral, civic and spiritual qualities, Dr. Bonham argued that quality in higher education essentially pertains to intellectual capacity and achievement.

A variety of trends, some as old as the nation, threaten quality in higher education, he suggested. Speaking of this country's time-worn (and honored) "particular tension between the search for excellence and the need to equalize opportunities" Dr. Bonham said that the drive toward equity and access was currently holding sway in postsecondary education, to the detriment of quality. An ever-present streak of anti-intellectualism residing in the American character (and in state Legislatures) also continues to corrode the cultivation of quality.

In addition, state higher education boards themselves have characteristics that can militate against quality. These include the tendency of the agencies to expand their own bureaucracies and powers and to proliferate rules and regulations all of which rob institutions of initiative and creativity. The development of state articulated higher education structures also tends to result in nondifferentiated, equalized funding mechanisms. Such mechanisms or formulas do not adequately take into account different resource requirements of different institutions and programs. Dr. Bonham gave the example of the submersion of the flagship university into a statewide system of schools, none of them particularly

distinguished. He urged that this trend be reconsidered. Dr. Bonham also chided state planners for falling prey to our era's tendency towards becoming over-specialized, calling for a consideration of substance before statistics, courage as well as managerial know-how.

The primary concern that Dr. Bonham returned again and again to was the misapplication of the egalitarian impulse in higher education planning. In his concluding remarks he said: "The necessary social equilibrium will ultimately not be served by the public belief that every human is equal in talent to everybody else, that maintaining quality is best defined by dividing the nation's educational goods equally among all... To maintain academic quality, you will need to energize your best resources and develop a social philosophy which may not always be politically attractive or make front-page news, and to defend the nation that there is nothing immoral about identifying and rewarding exceptional talent. Above all, you must devise better ways to make the student the ultimate centerpiece of your work, and not the system and coordinating framework within which you must work."

III. MAJOR ISSUES BEFORE THE STATE BOARDS

As several speakers at the conference observed, state boards stand in a unique and uniquely important position. As mediators between the institutions and the politicians, state boards are the single most disinterested party in what is already in some cases becoming a bitter struggle for survival. Boards' ability to maintain their independence and to plan for and protect the quality, diversity and access in their states' higher educational systems is of central importance.

A primary concern that underlay almost all discussions of statewide boards in the next decade revolved around the realization that it would be both difficult and necessary to strike new collaborative relations with institutions while at the same time providing meaningful leadership -- leadership that will be a good deal determined by legislative and executive pressures. Collaborative planning, goal determination and evaluation were all viewed as desirable but also as hard to achieve in a period when statewide needs and institutional needs may be at odds. The fostering of institutional autonomy, vigor and quality was seen as threatened by contemporary political imperatives for accountability, cost-effectiveness and cost cutting. New requirements to incorporate a great variety of nontraditional postsecondary institutions, programs and students into a well-articulated statewide higher educational system complicate the task enormously.

Boards' abilities to respond effectively to the new realities, to undertake meaningful statewide planning and mount appropriate program reviews will obviously require an understanding and mastery of many complex issues. These issues -- the great majority of which surfaced during the

seminar -- will be reported and discussed below. As both those who delivered papers and those who participated in the panel sessions touched on many similar and overlapping concerns, there will be no attempt to report separately on each session.

Proceeding, as it were, from the outer, macro-policy shell to the inner, more technical core, the most salient concerns discussed during the sessions were the following:

Summary of Concerns

1. Student Aid vs. Institutional Aid: A fundamental issue is the posture which the state board will take in regard to institutional change and adaptation to evolving social needs. Either the board can go the so-called free market route of promoting increased state aid to students, letting changes emerge as students vote with their feet, or the board can advocate more state intervention and seek to obtain state goals of quality, diversity, access and choice by promoting institutional aid and a strong hand for itself in planning and program review.

The free market route seems politically attractive, for no one has to take the blame for grim results such as institutional closures. But it depends on a variety of factors, such as accurate and well-disseminated information, fair competition and an extremely well-worked out student assistance program. Even with all these factors in place, the assumptions of ultimately benign outcomes to the workings of Adam Smith's "invisible hand" may be no more justified in the educational domain than they earlier were in the economic.

The other alternative, state intervention, raises other problems. Particularly during periods of retrenchment, the state role can easily

become viewed as negative and regulatory. State experiments with the use of positive incentives are quite rare in postsecondary education, and may be politically suspect because state funds must usually be tied to explicit programs, approved in advance.

Even though, in theory, a state should opt for the market model or the intervention model, in practice most states undertake activities of both kinds. We include brief mention of the issues here merely to show that the remaining discussions of planning and program review must not be thought to pre-empt the coverages of all state approaches to institutional change.

2. Current Issues in State Planning: Assuming, then, that a state board seeks to pursue state goals in postsecondary education by active intervention, what are some of the issues that need to be addressed? John Folger's "Notes on Planning," can be summarized as follows:

a. Planning for retrenchment will not be popular at the institutional level.

b. Nearly 90 percent of the states will need to undertake some form of retrenchment planning for their public institutions.

c. Academic planning has not been effectively related to fiscal planning and budgeting in most states.

d. State level academic planning has generally been separated from institutional academic planning.

e. State level academic planning has given inadequate attention to the evaluation of programs.

f. Most planning activities have given very little attention to manpower issues, except in high-cost, high-demand fields like the health professions.

g. There is a great need for accurate information for planning, especially during time of retrenchment. (This point was strongly emphasized in one of the other sessions, where the Carruthers/Orwig paper was presented.)

3. Differentiation of Function: A prime element in most state plans seeking to promote diversity, access, choice and quality in state systems of postsecondary education is some suggested pattern of differentiation of function. This pattern must go far beyond assigning diverse institutional role and scope statements with some degree of specificity for a time frame of three to five years. It must grapple with and give coherence to a whole package of related matters: student admission, transfer and articulation standards; tuition fee patterns meshed with student aid programs; possible differentials in faculty salary, teaching load and research activities and certainly a careful program review process (discussed further below) which correlates program evaluation to assigned role and scope.

4. The Question of Quality: Closely related to the cultivation of differentiated functions is the question of defining academic quality. In addition to emphasizing the institutional model -- e.g. the "flagship university" -- to bolster high-quality in its traditional sense, as eloquently urged by George Bonham, state boards need to develop alternative models of quality which foster institutional pride, the striving for excellence and program growth in institutions of varying missions. The identification of excellence of function as opposed to excellence of institutions was suggested as a conceptual approach to the problem. Mention was also made of the need to develop more knowledge about concepts of value-added as an aid to defining quality.

5. The need for Comprehensive State Planning, linked to other related activities. In the Millard address and in several panel discussions, the value of broad-gauged state planning was stressed. Millard, urged that it include the total postsecondary educational resources of a state -- public, private and proprietary. He also pointed to the need for state planning to be sensitive to the impact of federal programs, developments in elementary/secondary education and collective bargaining processes.

Panel sessions also emphasized the need for the planning process to deal with problems such as the following:

a. The changing nature of the student body -- part time/full time ratios; growth in adult learners and decline in traditional age groups. The consequences of these trends for FTE counts, institutional and state financing, and program justification and elimination must be pursued.

b. The whole series of issues connected with adult and continuing education, vocational education and education by out-of-state institutions. Examination of the financing, program evaluation, credit-worthiness, licensure and regulation of these differing programs must be undertaken.

c. The complex arena of faculty development and evaluation, though some present felt that this was not an appropriate issue for state board intervention.

d. The promotion of interinstitutional cooperation, through consortia, state-sanctioned regionalization of interstate compacts.

6. The Politics of Planning: Presumably any state board entering activities such as role and scope planning and program review has an appropriate juridical base for the exercise of such powers, but a companion question arises about the politics of planning. Mostly remarkable by its absence at the conference was any serious treatment of the political constraints on academic planning or program review.

One interesting discussion which did occur raised the issue of the possible dangers to the immunities normally granted academic programs from direct state accountability which might result from overly successful efforts to integrate academic planning and program review with budgeting. In theory such integration seems eminently logical; in practice it might result in thrusting state political personalities deep into academic program areas where normal state budgeting has not previously carried them. Clearly this is also an issue worth more careful thought.

7. Finally, the purposes, criteria, processes and powers of program review. The amount of discussion related to various aspects of this broad topic fully justified its number one rating on the Barak pre-conference survey of interests.

One could detect, amidst all the spirited give-and-take, several major strands of disagreement of each of the four aspects of program review.

Concerning purposes, many participants warned that while program review is obviously one of the many tools of retrenchment, it should be approached in its broader positive dimensions, as an aid to institutional and system self-renewal. Unfortunately, the session did not afford sufficient time to explore this challenge more thoroughly.

Concerning criteria, there was some disagreement between those who stressed the state board role in evaluating program quality (some even insisting that quality could be applied as an independent criterion) and those who felt that need, cost, productivity, duplication and other criteria were equally important, and in any case, had to be looked at in conjunction with quality before sound judgments could be rendered.

Concerning processes, opinion divided between those who favored a major role for the state board staff and/or outside consultants and those who felt that institutional participation was crucial. Also raised were the related issues of the relative desirability of lateral (horizontal) vs. institutional (vertical) reviews and of ad hoc vs. cyclical patterns. Also discussed in the context of processes were the needs of assuring due process and of developing incentives for institutional self-evaluation of programs.

Finally, concerning powers, there was a polite but firm disagreement between those who felt that the state board or state government should have final authority for program decisions, and those who felt these crucial academic judgments had to remain with the institutions.

It was generally agreed that much more remained to be learned about both the costs and the benefits of program review. It was pointed out that even though some reviews of existing programs resulted mostly in cosmetic changes even the symbolic aspects of the reviews may have some value for higher education with persons in state government.

A preliminary draft of a monograph on state level review of academic programs by Robert Barak and Robert Berdahl was distributed at the conference with the final version to be made available from IEP later in 1977.

IV. CONCLUDING REMARKS

Warren Hill, Executive Director, Education Commission of the States

It would be easy to be negative about all of the problems I've heard discussed and to conclude that we aren't doing too well. It's true that not everything we do is perfect and we could go home with a "pity poor us, we're in impossible assignments" attitude. We could agree that:

- We don't know what quality is
- We don't know how to assure equity
- We don't know how to plan, or whom to plan with
- We don't know how to avoid duplication or phase out programs or institutes
- We don't know how to measure what we are doing, or to relate our outcomes to costs

These, however, are not my conclusions. No one claims to be perfect in what he or she is doing but the evidence is clear that we are dealing with these problems and with considerable degrees of success. Half the battle is in being able to define the problem - and you are way past that stage. You have at this conference shared information, insights, strategies that bring considerable benefit to each of you. What do I conclude?

- That central agencies are finding increasingly productive ways of working with both the other educational components and the political leadership. We are finding common objectives and moving together, particularly in our work with political leaders.

- We are increasingly aware of the need - at all levels - for accurate and carefully defined information. We're learning how to best use it, share it and disseminate it.
- We have demonstrated planning and analytical skills and we can identify the viable policy options available to decision-makers.
- We can accept changed conditions and still be effective.

Let me send you home with these thoughts.

- Remember that people and institutions hear what they want to hear. It makes a difference whose ox is being gored. We need to be more specific.
- Bad proposals tend to live on. They are harder to kill than a snake on soft ground.
- Quality tends to be in the eye of the beholder - If I'm doing it, it's high quality. We need to establish agreed upon criteria before assessments are made.
- Money <u>does</u> make a difference. Not always, but usually you'll get lots of arguments that it won't.
- Those who resent your existence are the same ones who wish to have you champion their causes.
- The critical decisions affecting higher education are more apt to be made in legislative halls and in Congress than they are on campus - and your impact can be most significant because of that.
- Be proud of what you do. You are engaged in a complex, difficult, necessary and valuable activity. To the extent that you do your work well, you will increase opportunity, maintain and extend quality, and make it difficult for political leaders to make uninformed and indefensible decisions.

V. POSSIBLE FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS

On the basis of his observation of the conference discussions, Robert Berdahl then presented the following items to be considered as possible agenda for future action:

1. The first business at hand will obviously be a formal evaluation of the success of this conference. Evaluation sheets were collected during this session. (Reactions of the participants turned out to be extremely favorable).

2. If the conference is judged successful, discussions should be undertaken with SHEEO, IEP and ECS about holding another one within a year. Indications are of positive support so long as a new separate organization with all its paraphenalia is not created.

3. What would be possible, short of a formal structure, would be to develop a separate directory of state academic and program officers -- with or without a choice of several such persons to be spokespersons to SHEEO, IEP and ECS.

4. Issues identified in this summary or by other means could be linked up with interested academic and program staff, and some of these special interest groups could form "committees of correspondence" to exchange ideas and research in between meetings.

5. Alternatively or in addition, meetings of academic and program staff in the various regions could be encouraged, especially in regions not now served by interstate compacts; SHEEO or IEP could be urged to play a catalytic role.

6. Some central office -- perhaps ECS -- could be requested to maintain a roster of outside peer review consultants used by various states, ideally with some mode of confidential evaluation of their performance.

7. Some thought should be directed by this group or SHEEO to the advantages and disadvantages of the suggestion of one participant to add an out-of-state agency staffer to an otherwise professional program review team. This presumably would lead to some balance of criteria in judging programs but could also raise other problems.

8. This conference -- as a starter -- was overloaded with topics -- to help get a broad roster of identified problems and potential resources -- while being largely confined to academic planning and program officers. Perhaps both were needed to establish a territory. But, if future meetings are decided on, consideration should be given to the desirability of probing fewer problems at greater depth, and of inviting in more "outsiders" as resource people (not participants) to discuss interfaces of planning and program review. Such outsiders might be representatives of public, private and proprietary institutions as well as interested state and federal politicians and their key staff members.

9. If this "networking" proved helpful to state academic planners and program review officers, it might also be useful for others. Such networks for financial officers, and others in state agencies might be developed.

APPENDICES

Monday, July 18, 1977

TOPICS	
OPENING SESSION	Louis Rabineau, Director, Inservice Education Program Robert J. Barak, Director, Research & Information Iowa Board of Regents Robert W. Jacob, Assistant Commissioner - Missouri
THE MAINTENANCE OF ACADEMIC QUALITY IN A TIME OF UNCERTAINTY	Convener: Dan S. Hobbs, Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs -Oklahoma Speaker: George Bonham, Editor-in-Chief, CHANGE Magazine
STATE-LEVEL ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW PROCEDURES & PROBLEMS	Convener: John F. Porter, Executive Director, Commission on Higher Education - Alabama Discussants: Elizabeth Johnson, Member, Oregon Educational Coordinating Commission Theodore Hollander, Deputy Commissioner, New York; Chancellor-elect, New Jersey Phillip Sirotkin, Executive Director, WICHE
ISSUES OF STATEWIDE CONCERN IN HIGHER EDUCATION	Convener: John J. Conard, Executive Officer, Board of Regents - Kansas Speaker: Richard M. Millard, Director, Postsecondary Education Division, ECS

Tuesday, July 19, 1977

GENERAL SESSION: STATE OF THE SEMINAR	Convener: Robert J. Barak

ENROLLMENT DECLINES - Its impact, how are you meeting it? What legislative action has resulted?	Convener: William Carr, Associate Director, Commission on Higher Education - Alabama Resource Person: Stephen Dresch, President, Institute for Demographic & Economic Studies, Yale University
REGULATION OF INSTITUTIONS & ACCREDITATION - Problems? Control? Licensure? Accreditation?	Convener: Clifford Trump, Deputy Director for Academic Planning, State Board of Education - Idaho Resource Persons: Thurston Manning, Director, CIHE, North Central Assoc. of Colleges and Schools Barbara Mickey, Assoc. VP and Dean, University of of Northern Colorado Fred A. Nelson, VP, External Affairs, Nova University
ACADEMIC PLANNING IN A PERIOD OF DECLINE - What Changes in Planning are needed in a period of decline?	Convener: F. Gordon Foster, Assoc. Commissioner, State Board of Regents - South Dakota
COLLEGE CREDIT VS. VOCATIONAL CREDITS - Where to? By Design or Default?	Convener: Irving E. Dayton, Deputy Commissioner for Academic Affairs - Montana Resource Person: Jerry Miller, Director, Office on Educational Credit, ACE
NON-TRADITIONAL/CONTINUING EDUCATION PROGRAMS - Experimental Credit? Credit by Exam? How Best to Coordinate?	Convener: Gary Chamberlin, Assoc. Director, Department of Higher Education - Arkansas Resource Person: Keith Asplin, Director of Academic Affairs, Colorado CHE

PROGRAM REVIEW -SECOND LOOK	Convener: Donald P. Draine, Assistant Executive Director for Academic Planning - Minnesota Resource Persons: Joe McFarland, Academic Officer, Board of Regents- Kansas Robert J. Barak
ACADEMIC STATEWIDE PLANNING - (Manpower planning, mission and role, monitoring of role, enrollment projections)	Convener: Diane K. Youn, Assoc. in Higher Education Program Program Planning, Connecticut CHE Resource Person: John K. Folger, Coordinator for Policy Analysis, ECS
FACULTY DEVELOPMENT AND EVALUATION- (The role of faculty development and evaluation in a period of uncertainty)	Convener: John C. Wright, Vice Chancellor and Director for Academic Affairs - West Virginia Resource Persons: Bert C. Biles, Director, Center for Faculty Evaluation and Development in Higher Education Sandra C. Inglis, Policy Intern, Board of Regents - Ohio
ANALYTIC AND INFORMATION SUPPORT FOR ACADEMIC STATE-LEVEL PLANNING - (Concepts, procedures and products for improving state-level planning with focus on NCHEMS State-Level Information Base as an academic planning aid)	Convener: Frank A. Schmidtlein, Director of Research, Planning & Evaluation - Maryland Resource Persons: Melvin Orwig, Assoc. Director, NCHEMS Kent Caruthers,Senior Staff Associate, NCHEMS
THE ROLE OF INTERINSTITUTIONAL/ INTERSTATE COOPERATION IN A TIME OF LIMITED RESOURCES - (Consortia, cooperative programs and activities	Convener: Kenneth O'Brien, Assoc. Director, California Postseco Education Commission Resource Persons: Lewis D. Patterson, Executive Director, Council for I institutional Leadership Phillip Sirotkin, Executive Director, WICHE Alan D. Ferguson, Executive Director, NEBHE

	Steven Smartt, Staff Associate, SREB Charles I. Griffith, Director, State Planning Commission Program, USOE
ACADEMIC PLANNING AND BUDGETING RELATIONSHIPS - UTOPIA OR MIRAGE - ADVANTAGES AND DISADVANTAGES OF VARIED BUDGETARY APPROACHES	Convener: William Coulter, Vice Chancellor of Administration, Board of Regents - Ohio Resource Person: Richard J. Meisinger, Coordinator of Academic Programs, Council of Higher Education for Virginia
STUDENT TRANSFER AND ARTICULATION - (Between 2-year and 4-year, public and private institutions)	Convener: E. Grady Bogue, Assoc. Director for Academic Affairs, CHE - Tennessee Resource Person: David Trivett, Research Associate, ERIC Clearinghouse on Higher Education
GENERAL SESSION: (1) What You've Always Wanted to Know but Haven't Had Answered Yet; (2) Conference Synthesis and Critique	Convener: Louis Rabineau Presenter: Robert O. Berdahl, Professor & Chairperson, Department of Higher Education, SUNY at Buffalo
GENERAL SESSION: One (or more!) for the Road	Convener: M. Olin Cook, Message from President of SHEEO Presenter: Warren G. Hill, Executive Director, ECS
Adjournment of Seminar	

Appendix B

Keynote Address

THE MAINTENANCE OF ACADEMIC QUALITY IN A TIME OF UNCERTAINTY

July 18, 1977

GEORGE W. BONHAM

Editor-in-Chief
CHANGE MAGAZINE

Presented at the ECS/Inservice Education Program Seminar:

"The Maintenance of Academic Quality in a Time of Uncertainty"
Keystone Lodge - Keystone, Colorado
July 18-20, 1977

Inservice Education Program
Education Commission of the States
1860 Lincoln Street, Suite 300
Denver, Colorado 80295

IEP Seminar
Keystone Lodge
July 18, 1977
George W. Bonham

Ladies and Gentlemen:

Unlike the folks you run around with, my friends are a rather simpleminded lot, and they believe almost anything I tell them. When I revealed to one of my associates that I was going out to Colorado to address a SHEEO/ECS/IEP seminar, he assumed that I was going to lecture the National War College on the strategic importance of the Cruise missile. I obviously did not wish to disappoint him, leaving his own imagination intact, and explained that he simply couldn't understand the importance of it all.

As a magazine editor, I have, of course, a more than passing interest in the campaign for the use of plain English. I'm afraid that anyone now wishing to enter the labyrinthian ways of the academic must not only watch their P's and Q's, but also carry around a dictionary of the one thousand most important academic acronyms. I might tell you that I happen to represent a multiple organization called ECF/CM/CPS/CMP. (Of course NCHMS sounds really much better!) For those not sufficiently hip on such matters, I shall explain -- but only once -- that this stands for the Educational Change Foundation-Change Magazine-Change Professional Services-Change Magazine Press, all of which obligations take far too much time for me to leave much room to spoof those who maltreat the English language.

I do not fault government employees any more on this score than others in American life. Anyone who misbehaves in my office is consigned to one month's worth of reading college news releases. It is almost an instant cure, but does give some clinical insight into this form of foot-in-mouth disease. I remember, some time in the late sixties, when the president of Princeton University wrote a letter to the Princeton alumni. "You are probably aware," he began, "that we have been experiencing very considerable, potentially explosive, expressions of dissatisfaction on issues only

partially related." Well, he meant that the students had given his college a bad time. I recall President Franklin Roosevelt's reaction to a 1942 government memo concerning blackouts. It said:

> Such preparations shall be made as will completely obscure all Federal buildings and non-Federal buildings occupied by the Federal government during an air raid for any period of time from visibility by reason of internal or external illumination."

"Tell them," Roosevelt said, "that in buildings where they have to keep the work going to put something across the windows."

I think that one of the characteristics of our time is that the experts -- and you certainly belong to that elite group -- tend to know more and more about less and less. Martin Trow has written elsewhere about the private and public lives of academics. My own sense of this field would tempt me to dissect the academy even further, into still smaller pieces. There are semiautonomous miniworlds in higher education, which exist pretty much within their own coteries, and touch adjacent worlds all the way from frequently to only rarely. Your world is the role of the states in the improvement and oversight of education beyond the high school. Even within your own staffs, you tend to develop further groups and subgroups. We have many such worlds in the academy, and I would hesitate to count them all. There are the worlds of student admissions, financial aid, medical and engineering education, biomedical research, university management, student personnel, fund-raising, consortia, church education bodies, student union officers, and alumni relations. Each by now is an integral and relatively large sub world of its own. You will no doubt have noticed that I have not even referred to the scholarly societies, to faculty organizations, college athletics, or, to that most unique and most influential group of all -- Change Magazine subscribers!

This fragmentation of knowledge, of initiatives, and of responsibilities, is a necessary if lamentable part of modern life. We should not assume, however, that it does not interpose serious hurdles to a larger understanding of the issues, let alone the shape of the future. When I was a young man in the infantry during World War II, marching across Germany, I always assumed that my superior officers, and certainly the general in charge of my division, knew the plans and objectives of the entire campaign on the Western flank. Only much later did I learn that even they were concerned with only a limited sector of the campaign.

This growing tendency towards the expert specialist in higher education is not only an American phenomenon, though the sheer size of our own system makes this probably more necessary. Last week I returned from Sweden, which in the entire country enrolls less than 35,000 post-secondary students, and supports a teaching staff of seven thousand. And yet, what struck me in my visits with the government agency responsible for higher education was that as soon as the conversation veered from the area of one's particular responsibility, the response was, "Well, I'm not quite sure about that. You'll really have to ask the so-and-so Bureau about that." What was the total government budget in all forms of higher and continuing education in Sweden, I asked? Most of the experts I interviewed at the Swedish Board of Universities could give me no precise figures on the matter. Nor were they in any way embarrassed that they could not. One would have thought, of course, that the European approach to organizing education under one centralized ministry would avoid this kind of refraction of general knowledge about the field. But this does not seem to be the case.

Nor is it made easy in this country to have a sufficient national overview of academic matters to make the kinds of sagacious observations which would encompass the value systems and interests of the country as a whole. Nonetheless, I believe that such generalists, even if small in number, are absolutely necessary. David Riesman, with a literally encyclopedic knowledge of higher education sociology, is unique in this country, if not the world. John Gardner learned more about education, I suspect, by heading the 1964 White House Conference on Education, than after 11 years with the Carnegie Corporation. Frank Newman, a remarkably spright and vigorous critic of higher education, had occasion to take on this national focus with the help of two federal task forces on academic reform. He is now doing penance by having to run a state university, which is quite a different matter from being a national critic. Clark Kerr would never have gained his bird's eye knowledge of higher education at the University of California. It took a $6 million national commission to elevate him to a sufficiently high observation post to see the entire academic firmament. I know that critics have taken after the Carnegie Commission for not dealing with issues of learning content. While this is a debatable issue, I would and have argued that the very existence of the Commission made possible the coming together of varied talents, who could for once take sufficient time and sufficient reflection to look at American higher education as a whole.

Having said all that, I come to the matter of quality, and its maintenance in the face of innumerable threats, of which the scarcity of public funds is only one. I would not presume to prescribe to you a single formula, a particular break-through approach, to one of the

fundamental questions which faces you in education as it does others elsewhere around the country. I would wager that the same kind of central question is being asked -- or at least ought to be asked -- by our armed forces, by the United States Postal Service, by Amtrak, by various hospital corporations, by jurists, by our leading scientists, and, indeed, by anyone sufficiently interested in the quality of public services. It is an extraordinarily difficult question to answer. It entails issues relating to public morality, to social sensibilities, to money, to citizens expectations, to consumer demand, and even to definitions of language. What quality are we talking about? Intellectual quality? Qualities of human perceptions? Social sensitivities? Personal insights? Qualities of reason? Or commitment? Qualities of sheer heart and compassion?

Recently I spoke before a small inner city Catholic college, which had just lost its accreditation. "Mr. Bonham," asked one department chairman, "how do we maintain quality in this institution and still stay alive?" Well, it was obvious that here was not a mini-Harvard. But perhaps its own sense of what qualities were worth preserving were more salient to the needs of its particular community. If that college could teach its students marketable skills, some social sophistication which spoke to humanistic values, and the respect of others, could teach that attacking old people and raping helpless women in that urban jungle were clearly beneath their own sense of dignity and simply contemptuous -- if these matters could be taught and learned, did not this bring a quality of education to this community that was somehow at least as worthy as 700 SAT scores and being a shoo-in for Yale Law School?

These are still the issues bound to the eternal questions of human worth. They need to be discussed in every state and every community where people still care about the improvement of human life. (In this connection, I like very much the effort of the state education agency of Tennessee to develop a series of definitions of goals and quality, which it wishes both students and institutions of learning to reach out to. Not everyone will agree with their definitions. The effort is the important thing.)

The issue of maintaining quality in a period of leveling is as old a question as America itself. Foreign observers such as DeTocqueville and Gunnar Myrdal have seen with particular acuteness this particular tension between our search for excellence and the need to equalize opportunities. We still tend to believe in general that one can be equal and superior at the same time, that the potential for human growth is only bounded by the given opportunity, and, of course, access thereto.

We are now in one of those periods where this sentiment towards equalizing through wider access to higher learning runs particularly strong. It was not always so. Thomas Jefferson, in his Notes on Virginia, made a plan for elementary schooling, by which, he said, "twenty of the best geniuses will be raked from the rubbish annually." Jefferson returned several times to this theme of rigorous intellectual selection, notably in his "Bill for the More General Diffusion of Knowledge."

The American attitude towards intellectuality has always been ambiguous, to say the least. Were one to ask average Americans about the leading intellectual lights in this country, I doubt that they could name anyone beyond perhaps Margaret Mead and Eric Hoffer. So it is clearly not the kind of quality of excellence that lies just beneath the public consciousness. Jacques Barzun, in his The House of Intellect, puts this peculiarly American ambiguity this way: "Since it is seldom clear whether intellectual activity denotes a superior mode of being or a vital deficiency, opinion swings between considering intellect a privilege and seeing it as a handicap. As a privilege it must be assailed, as a handicap it seems so easily remedied that it is scorned. In neither phase is the feeling whole and assured, for the attack and the derision alike testify to a quality that gives no hold to the philanthropic impulse. This is why the 'egghead' and the 'grind' are not pitied like the physical cripple, even though all three are deemed miscarriages of nature. Intellect is thus simultaneously looked up to, resented, envied, and regarded with cold contempt.

So much, then, for the American view of intellect. The connective tissue between the celebration of the mind and academic quality is, of course, intimate and apparent to most people in academic life, or

so it would at least appear. But no matter how we care to define those human qualities that serve both private and public ends, we have on the whole ignored one fundamental law of physics, which applies to national destinies as well: When you freely intermix the rich with the poor, high pressure with a vacuum vessel, high density with low density, concentrated color with clear liquid, what you end up with is something in between. In the sociological idiom, those heretofore less fortunate are thus largely benefiting from that "something in between", while those once high in the saddle suffer a definite decline in the quality of whatever it is they are now engaged in.

I recently watched a television documentary on the rural health delivery system in Nigeria. The health minister was under great pressure from his few foreign-trained medical specialists to have the government pay for ever more costly medical research and laboratory equipment. Nigeria's handful of elite medical specialists all work in Lagos, and they were used to expect the best technology from their training in England and the United States. The health minister turned them all down. Nor for ten years at least, he said, could he afford new electron microscopes and radiation equipment. The public investment was to be made in 250 new rural health clinics, primitive but effective, because, as he said, "We are going to divide what little we have among all our people, and not only those who can afford the high fees of Lagos specialists." For him, quality meant minimal health care for the millions, not maximal, 20th century medicine for the few.

The dilemmas which you face in your daily planning are really not all that different, at least in principle. If you are going to have open access for virtually all high school graduates (and why not adult non-high schoolers?), you are not going to reach a per capita quality

education in 100,000 students that you could have achieved for five thousand students twenty years ago. And neither the quality of that total education, nor the average quality of the new entering students, can be as high as it was two decades ago for the elite few. To say otherwise is not to face matters squarely.

I have only one quarrel with the concept that mass and class are social ideals towards which one should constantly strive, even though their total fulfillment would seem unlikely, or in fact practically warranted. My quarrel lies not with the evolving facts in the matter, but with an overbearing proclivity of public administrators to confuse statistical perfection for educational quality. We are now so encumbered by processes, management information systems, and efforts to perfect accountability, that we often forget that one ounce of social courage may very well be worth a pound of managerial know-how. When, last year, we published a major financial analysis on the fiscal state of higher education, no one thought of asking, including ourselves, how much this management of resources had affected academic quality. To be sure, it is good news that colleges are now better balancing their budgets. That makes them heroes in the eyes of coordinating boards and legislatures and governors. But what, may I ask, has been given up? What is worth preserving, and what has been lost?

The dilemma also appears in other forms. There are a number of states with which I am personally acquainted, who used to maintain one first-rate, flagship research university, and below that a healthy roster of two and four-year colleges. That flagship university was soon competing against an ambitious major state college turned state university, and then a third and a fourth. The race for equality was on, and it was perfectly agreeable to the political leaders, of course.

The subsequent leveling took its predictable course. What we have in many states is a marshmellow system of academic institutions, none of them topflight and none of them very bad. Nobody after all is supposed to deserve better than anybody else. Thus, the state formula, pure and simple, of x-dollars for each equivalent full-time student has become a sturdy and politically attractive modus operandi.

The problem with all of this is that human talents do not follow these political sentiments. It is simply not in fact true that a state's investment in training a computer programmer for an associate of arts degree should cost the same as that for a molecular physicist, a lawyer or an architect. And I ask myself this: If the political process were a little more logical than it is, would and should it not be argued that we can draw away a bit on our per student investments in the lower reaches and add some incremental budgets in favor of one or two research universities, or specialized liberal arts schools, or other academic ventures in which the people of that state happen to have a particular interest?

One of the best of the state chancellors, who recently retired from one of the top state systems in the country, recently wrote me as follows:

> When my state decided to broaden the opportunity for higher education, it first established a community college system. The community colleges were basically an extension of high school. Teachers were required to be certified and were thereby equated with high school teachers as to salary. From other facts it was clear that unit costs of education were to be less than the unit cost of the university effort at the lower division. These differences constituted a clear case of differentiation based on an elitist concept. I differentiated between these institutions, both through a terminology of designating the two older universities as "graduate research centers" and establishing funding concepts which recognized the need for richer funding of the Centers. But pressures have eroded this concept, and the concept as to the equity and validity of this funding

> process were again opened. My impression is that once the question was opened, numbers became powerful and the two older institutions are in a minority in many ways. The democratic process resulted in a narrowing of the differentiation.... I remain puzzled why we insist upon winners and losers and rankings in the world of sports and then claim everyone is equal in intellectual activities. Those of us in education play a game of pretend and I would be something less than realistic to advocate that we abandon the rules of the game....The extension of educational opportunity is a positive good and should not be retracted. My question is whether it cannot be delivered to some groups at a lower cost in order to restore the excellence in at least limited areas.
>
> I think that there you have it, in a nutshell.

Let me illustrate this dilemma in another way: We now know enough through research of the learning process and student environments, of what provides an optimum setting for learning. And yet, public agencies almost invariably ignore the evidence and act to the contrary. To illustrate: We know that, generally speaking, smaller and more intimate learning settings are incrementally important in making the largest learning difference for a student. Yet, state planners, academic and political leaders opt for larger and larger campus units. Research shows that private institutions on the whole represent better settings in terms of developing affective aspects of learning than public institutions. The trend is obviously to the opposite. Research shows that residential colleges are far superior to commuting campuses in achieving significant changes in student behavior and socialization. And yet, underprivileged students, who would seem to benefit most from such influences, are less exposed to residential settings than those from the middle class.

And so it goes. The difficulties of relating educational research to public policy are well known and need no elaboration by me. But it does illustrate the seeming inability of political and semipolitical institutions to look at the research evidence as a means for determining

public policy. I have the highest respect for the extraordinary complexities of state government. State coordinating boards, I have always thought, find themselves in a particularly unfortunate never-never land. They stand between the executive and legislative branches of government and academic institutions, but they have no political constituencies of their own, are damned for being in the pockets of the academics or in the pockets of the politicos. It must surely seem to many among you as a no-win situation.

And yet, I think there are beginning to be opportunities for a more creative transition from the last decade's application of managerialism to higher education, to a concern over the next decade of how to best translate available dollars into maximal benefits for individual rather than institutional needs. How this is to be done is fortunately not in my province to say. But here are some essential elements that must be preserved and better attended to in the future:

The first is the principle that the best kind of government is still minimal government. If you deprive imaginative academic institutions of the natural initiatives that spring forth from their own creative wellsprings, you will have in your states exactly what you deserve: marshmallow routinized education.

Secondly, you must make a daily, conscious effort to deal with <u>educational</u> substance, since, but the very definition of your function, success largely lies in dealing with what can be most easily measured, rather than what can not.

Thirdly, we shall arrive again in this country at the point where people will ask the qualitative questions about human accomplishments. They are already being asked in terms of levels of literacy. They will

soon be asked in terms of other issues, such as private and public morality, and the development of collaborative as opposed to competitive human beings. You will be asked to encourage human flexibility as well as human potential, human compassion as well as professional expertise, public morality instead of public brutality.

This country will have to turn some crucial corners within the lifetimes of your students. These coming years will only vaguely resemble the years past. The necessary social equilibrium will ultimately not be served by the public belief that every human is equal in talent to everybody else, that maintaining quality is best defined by dividing a nation's educational goods equally among all. Some players on the world stage are more equal than others, and we will need to identify the best and the brightest from every walk of life, from every station and every nook and cranny of our society. To maintain academic quality, you will need to energize your best resources, and develop a social philosophy which may not always be politically attractive or make front-page news, and to defend the notion that there is nothing immoral about identifying and rewarding exceptional talent. Above all, you must devise better ways to make the student the ultimate centerpiece of your work, and not the system and coordinating framework within which you must work. Your monthly statistics contain a thousand human tales, each different from the other. As a public servant, you should be responsive to these consumers who must be both your judge and beneficiary.

I have no doubt that your responsibilities will be more burdensome in the years ahead. But they could also be more creative, and more satisfying. You and your colleagues are largely responsible for one third of our national investment in higher learning. More of our national future depends on you than you have probably imagined.

Democracy, untutored and unfettered, soon enough turns into a mob and anarchy. It will be that crucial margin of excellence that could make the difference. I think we are entering a new era of social balancing, and you will need all your wits about you to preserve what is best, along with what is basic in a democratic setting.

Appendix C

ISSUES OF STATEWIDE CONCERN IN HIGHER EDUCATION

July 18, 1977

RICHARD M. MILLARD

Director

Postsecondary Education Division
Education Commission of the States

Presented at the ECS/Inservice Education Program Seminar:

"The Maintenance of Academic Quality in a Time of Uncertainty"
Keystone Lodge, Keystone, Colorado
July 18-20, 1977

Inservice Education Program
Education Commission of the States
1860 Lincoln Street, Suite 300
Denver, Colorado 80295

ISSUES OF STATEWIDE CONCERN IN HIGHER EDUCATION

Prior to this seminar on academic affairs, Bob Barak circulated a questionnaire to determine what the major areas of interest or concern among the academic officers in state higher education agencies currently are. In some respects the results are not surprising. The issues ranged from program review with highest priority closely followed by academic quality to impact of federal programs on state operations. Most of these issues are being addressed in various sessions of the seminar. What I would like to do this evening is step back a bit and ask what is a more fundamental question, for on the answer or answers to it may depend the possibility of state level academic officers asking any questions at all. The unsteady state or the time of uncertainty, I would suggest, applies not only to higher and postsecondary educational institutions but to coordinating and governing structures as well. The critical question may well be whether existing coordinating and governing structures are adequate to deal with the changing conditions, the unsteady state, and the time of uncertainty.

Such questions about the adequacy of existing coordinating and governing structures are being asked across the country. The oldest coordinating board, the New York Board of Regents, along with the existing institutional structures in the State of New York have been under review by the Wessell Commission. While 23 states between 1970 and 1975 modified their state higher education agencies, the rate of such review and modification seems to be increasing. Six states during the 1976 legislative session considered, but did not adopt, changes from coordinating to consolidated governing boards. In Colorado the legislative joint budget committee in 1976 directly took over from the coordinating board the function of budget development and review for higher education. Although new legislation this

session has modified the earlier action a major legislative study of higher educational structure has been authorized. In the neighboring state of Nebraska legislation has been passed that assigns directly to the legislature and its committees the task of determining institutional role and scope. Connecticut has just adopted new legislation modifying the coordinating board structure and increasing its powers. In a series of other states from Michigan to Alabama and from Utah to Massachusetts at least some legislators are reviewing current systems and suggesting changes.

The questions that have to be asked are: Why all this ferment at this time? Does this mean that current forms of coordination and governance have failed? What are the issues that are causing public and legislative concern? These are not easy questions nor are they subject to simple answers. Probably the most critical questions is the third and the answers to the first and second, to the extent that they have answers, lie in attempting to answer it. It may well be the case, for example, not that current forms of coordination and governance have failed, but that the conditions under which such boards are established no longer prevail. Some aspects of the current problems may in fact have grown out of some of the past successes and failures of such boards, granting that even these may vary considerably from state to state.

Few if any reasonably sophisticated people in higher or postsecondary education or in state government would deny that we are moving into a considerably different period in postsecondary or higher education and in the relations of state government to higher and postsecondary education than was the case even in the recent past. Elsewhere, I have suggested that the situation might be considered analogous to a new ball

game in which the conditions, the playing field, and the rules have shifted, but not all the players have recognized the shift or discovered the new rules. In fact this is not surprising because one striking characteristic of the new game is that the rules themselves seem to be in a constant state of transition.

It should be remembered that while the first coordinating board goes back to 1784, the major period of the development of coordinating and governing boards occurred from 1960 to 1972. During this time 23 such boards were established with a 24th added in 1976. Today if we include 2 executively appointed planning boards, all 50 states have boards of some type although these vary tremendously in authority, responsibility, composition and even size of operations. Of these 19 are governing boards, 29 are coordinating boards, and 2 are executively appointed planning boards. The period of major development of coordinating boards coincided not accidentally with the largest period of expansion of higher education in the history of the country. Between 1960 and 1970 alone enrollments increased 126 percent; expenditures increased 207 percent; and states built more than 400 new campuses. Most of the boards established by statute or constitution during this period were charged with "providing for the orderly growth of public higher education." Most of the powers given to such coordinating boards (in contrast to governing boards) were related to problems of growth such as review and/or approval of new programs, developing priorities for capital outlay, master planning for program complementation, and budgetary review for assuring equity in meeting needs. On the whole these boards performed these functions well. Today the situation is very different and, as noted, the question becomes not whether they succeeded but whether existing boards are adequate to deal with the changing conditions.

While many of you are intimately familiar with some of these changed conditions, at a seminar like this they may well be worth briefly reviewing.

The first among these changing conditions is the student situation. To some extent expansion has continued at a lesser rate and somewhat unevenly in different types of institutions from 1970 through 1975. While enrollments dropped slightly this last fall (1976) they may continue to expand unevenly until 1980 although this is doubtful. However, you are also aware of the demographic facts in relations to the traditional college age population -- the 18-to-24-year-olds. This group will decrease in the 80s and there is little evidence that it will increase in the 90s. Even the Carnegie projections that the next decade of substantial growth will be from 2,000 to 2,010 is at best speculative. While the national average is supposed to drop by 4.1 percent by 1985 in some states the drop may be as large as 22.3 percent. In only 4 states are modest increases in the age group expected. The predictions for future enrollment, while varying considerably depending upon the source, are not for further expansion but at best for holding about even assuming a shift in enrollment in most institutions to older students and at worst a radical decline. Added to the population change is the drop in number of high school graduates going on to college from 55 percent in 1968 to 48 percent in 1974 plus the fact that the proportion of high school graduates to total high school age population instead of continuing to increase as predicted in the 60s has not only levelled off but started to decline. Clearly not all institutions will be equally affected. The regional public colleges and universities and the non-prestigious smaller private institutions may have the most difficult time but major increases anywhere are likely to be rare indeed.

The colleges and universities are thus on the whole faced with prospects either of declining enrollments or developing new student clineteles, or more likely both at the same time. While there may indeed be a large group of older citizens potentially interested in further education, the assumption that they will compensate either for the declining 18-to-24-year-olds or that they will, if they come, engender the same or increasing levels of state support are at least open to question. Average college-going age has gone up in the last few years. Close to half of the current college students are over the "traditional" college-age and one in every ten students is over 35. The question can at least be raised as to whether the more interested older students are not already present, and one may wonder how large the actual reserve of additional interested adults is. It is reasonably clear that additional older adults will not come in large numbers simply by opening the doors of traditional institutions to such students. The institutions that have had most success in involving older students are those that have been willing to make major changes in curriculum, services, and modes of instruction to take education to the students rather than expecting the students to come to education. Even the assumption that increased numbers of older students will bring increased funding is also open to question. Some governors and legislators have taken the position that working older students and not the state should be willing to pay more of the costs of their additional education.

In addition to the enrollment picture there is considerable state and national concern with what appears to be overproduction of highly educated manpower not only among persons with doctorates but to college graduates in general, many of whom appear to be unable to find employment commensurate with their educational backgrounds. Projections that

less than 20 percent of the labor force need college degrees do not help and the "college, who needs it?" attitude is still growing and has had impact on both public and private funding sources including legislators. More than a few people at the state level argue that if additional funds are to be spent for postsecondary education they should be invested in more clearly vocational and occupational areas rather than in general support for higher education.

To the student situation must be added the fiscal situation. Some of the private institutions were beginning to feel the pinch between inflation and escalating costs on the one hand and restricted sources of income on the other as early as the mid-60s. By the early-70s legislators in some states were becoming alarmed at increasing costs and demands for funds for public institutions. This was complicated by the growing credibility gap between the public including governors and legislators and higher education, a gap growing out of student unrest and what was and still is perceived, whether correctly or not, to be less than efficient management of higher educational institutions. Since then, with recession and depression, the situation has become progressively more difficult. State budgets have been trimmed. In a few cases appropriations for higher education have actually been decreased. In most states the rate of increase for higher education has been reduced. A number of states and systems have had mandatory cutbacks. The picture is obviously further complicated by the fact that costs have escalated in all other government service areas as well and higher education has lost its priority status. Given the higher priorities in welfare, health, energy, conservation and highways, the hard fact seems to be that even with the upturn in the economy and re-emergence of state surpluses the

likelihood in most states of major new funds for higher education is not great.

Added to these other higher priority areas is the growing competition for funds within education between elementary-secondary education and postsecondary education. In some states this is already acute. Even though enrollments are dropping in elementary-secondary more rapidly than higher education, public conern with a return to the basics and reform in elementary-secondary education, continued concern with school district equalization, and increased costs relating to federal programs such as the new handicapped legislation tend in many quarters to give elementary-secondary education a higher priority than postsecondary education.

As the funds have become tighter and the priority for higher education has dropped, a third factor has become progressively more important; that is, the demand on the part of state government and the general public for greater accountability. This demand for increased accountability is also in part a byproduct of the period of student unrest and the credibility gap we mentioned earlier. Few people even within the higher education community would deny that institutions should in fact be accountable for the effective, even efficient, use of public funds and to a greater or lesser extent they always have been. The new emphasis upon accountability has, however, taken a number of differert forms, some of which extend considerably beyond fiscal accounting for the use of funds. Among these have been development of management information systems, program budgeting, zero-based budgeting, performance audit and program review.

As the fiscal situation has tightened and decision making has become more difficult, institutions and state agencies as well as legislators have progressively come to recognize the need for more effective information systems and revisions in the budgeting process. To some extent with the help of such organizations as the National Center for Higher Education Management Systems, including the State Level Information Base Project, the American Council on Education and the National Association of College and University Budget Officers institutions and state agencies have themselves taken the lead in developing instruments for more effective reporting and analysis. Budgeting is, however, another matter and there is real question whether enrollment driven budget formulas which work well in periods of expansion will be adequate to periods of contraction. In addition, in some states there is considerably less than congruence between the ways in which higher education budgets and other state budgets are developed and requests made.

A more recent development with far-reaching implications for state higher or postsecondary education agencies and institutions has been the growing state interest, even demand in some cases, not only with fiscal audits but with performance audits. Some 20 states have developed their own counterparts to the federal Government Accounting Office established as legislative or executive independent auditing agencies. While these have not been established primarily to audit higher or postsecondary education, higher education or some component of it frequently has been a first target or primary concern, for unlike other areas of public service, it usually is not tied to mandatory funding formulas.

Unfortunately, the state-of-the-art of performance audit is not very advanced. It does bring into play issues of outcomes, results and effective means of achieving them. The question of criteria to be used

in such audits is critical and does move to the heart not just of fiscal but of academic effectiveness. Far too frequently when such audits are attempted by independent government agencies the prime criterion is likely to be efficiency rather than educational effectiveness. If educational effectiveness is to be measured, serious question can be raised as to whether noneducational government agencies are equipped to do so and, if they do, whether this does not weaken the integrity of the academic process. But the insistence upon such audits of educational effectiveness not only remains but is likely to increase and the question becomes whether the state higher education agency in cooperation with the academic community is able or willing to undertake such audits. If not, it seems rather clear that there are others who will do so, whether qualified or not.

A fourth factor has been the recognition at the state level as well as federally that public higher education, while an essential part, is only one part of the postsecondary education universe. It does not even comprise all of public postsecondary education for in many states it does not include much of public postsecondary vocational education. And yet the states are spending considerable amounts of money on public postsecondary vocational education, sometimes in direct duplication of occupational programs in community colleges and even regional colleges and universities. Public higher education obviously does not include independent higher education or proprietary education yet both of these sectors constitute important parts of the resources of the state in postsecondary education. State concern particularly for reinforcing the independent institutions or including them in resource analyses, is clearly evidenced in the fact that some 43 states make some form of direct or indirect aid available to them now. It has become clear that

in planning and in considering the postsecondary education resources of the state, the full range of postsecondary education in the state is going to have to be taken into account from now on.

A fifth factor that should at least be noted is the continuing development of collective bargaining on the nation's campuses. What the full impact of faculty collective bargaining not only on individual campuses but on statewide coordinating and governing systems will be is not yet clear. While it is not yet a nationwide phenomenon it is becoming so. Where collective bargaining has made inroads it has not only changed intrainstitutional modes of operation but in some states, e.g., New York, has led to negotiations of faculty bargaining units not with the local or system administrators but with the Office of Employee Relations in the governor's office. The implications of this for direct state involvement in the daily affairs of campuses are somewhat staggering. Whether the state coordinating or governing board is directly involved in the process or not, the board will have to take the impact of collective bargaining into account in planning, budgeting and operational limitations. It is still not quite clear (in spite of the City University of New York experience) what the role of faculty bargaining units will be when and if retrenchment, program review and consolidation, and performance audit come more fully into play. It can reasonably be assumed, however, that collective bargaining is not likely to make the process easier.

A sixth factor of growing importance is the impact of federal legislation and regulations on statewide postsecondary educational activities. In one sense this is nothing new. State approval agencies for veterans affairs go back to the G.I. Bill at the end of World War II. The Higher Education

Facilities Act of 1963 called for statewide facilities commissions with responsibilities for planning and priorities in allocation of funds. The Higher Education Act of 1965 added community service and continuing education advisory committees. The Education Admendments of 1972 permitted the designation of existing state higher education agencies or creation of new postsecondary education planning commissions and related these to planning for community colleges (Title X A, never funded) and postsecondary vocational education. The Education Amendments of 1976 in addition assigned to states the responsibility for planning in relation to lifelong learning and educational information centers. Through the 1972 and 1976 amendments states were encouraged to develop or expand their scholarship programs and those states not already in the guaranteed student loan business were given incentives to do so. In addition, federal affirmative action, civil rights and handicapped legislation have direct impact on state agencies as well as state institutions. No one is yet sure what the impact of the new handicapped legislation will have in proscribing free education to handicapped persons to the age of 21. These are examples rather than the full picture. What is new is the range of federal programs that call for statewide plans and impose regulations and additional responsibilities on state agencies. There is little indication that this will lessen. What it means is that progressively more staff and time on the part of state higher or postsecondary education agencies will have to be devoted to state planning for federal purposes (as well as state purposes) and to deal with federal regulations and programs. It is critically important that the state and federal programs be looked at and planned for in relation to each other.

A seventh factor is what might be described as changing legislative and executive expectations. We have touched on this in accountability and performance audit. In some respects it might be considered a further elaboration of accountability or as a reaction to what has been perceived, whether correctly or not, by some legislators and governors as lack of accountability. It is what might be described as a demand for greater responsibility through further centralization and control. It reflects a feeling that coordinating and even some governing boards are too weak or not sufficiently inclusive, that institutions have not been willing to cooperate effectively with them and have been and are engaged in end runs, and that the only way responsibility can be fixed and the hard realities of today dealt with is by establishing a strong single governing board for all public institutions that can control the system and make the hard decisions necessary. While this may be considered by some an overly simplistic answer, it nevertheless not only is a real alternative but one that is appealing and does address some of the problems. A coordinating board by the nature of the case is in a difficult position. It is likely to be suspected by the legislature and governor as being a front for institutional interests and by the institutions as being the hatchet group for the legislature and governor. While the governing board is clearly the protagonist for its members it has the advantage from the legislative and executive points of view of being one body or even, in the president or chancellor, one person to deal with instead of many and one focus of responsibility for seeing that the system operates. Such consolidated governing boards have worked in some cases and may indeed be appropriate answers for some states.

However, there is a further step beyond this or an alternative to it. There is developing in some states a trend to move responsibility for higher and postsecondary education decisions directly to the executive and/or legislative branches of the state government. With the growth of executive and legislative staffs where institutions do not work effectively with coordinating agencies or governing board would create a consolidated protagonist, the tendency is for executive and/or legislative branches of government to take over directly the major functions of budget review, audit control and decision making for higher or post-secondary education. We began by pointing out that in Colorado last year a powerful joint budget committee of the legislature abolished the budget preparation review functions of the coordinating board and reserved these wholly to itself and that in Nebraska a law has been enacted that places the responsibility for developing institutional role and scope in a legislative committee. In some cases it has been proposed that the planning functions be taken over by a general state or governor's planning agency where higher or postsecondary education is considered only one among competing state agencies seeking funds. The message seems to be clear. If institutions are not willing to work cooperatively with appropriate state postsecondary education agencies or the agencies are not able to exert the leadership to develop effective planning and program review, the executive and legislative offices of state government are prepared to move in to create more centralized and responsive agencies or to take over the functions of coordination, decision making and control themselves.

This brings us back full circle to the questions with which we began. In the light of these changed conditions what are the "new" responsibilities for statewide coordination and governance? I might suggest a few A

number of these have already been suggested in noting the changed conditions. Some of these are new only in the sense of being more urgent or critical than before. Others have recently emerged as matters of major concern. The list should be considered as illustrative and not exhaustive.

First, statewide planning has always been a major responsibility of statewide coordination and/or governance. But the nature of that planning has changed. Instead of planning for expansion, the much more difficult planning for steady or decreasing enrollments, for retrenchment, is now crucial. If this is to be done it will require systematic program review not just of new programs but of existing programs, establishment of priorities with a view to protecting quality, preserving diversity, and eliminating duplication and nonacademically productive programs. Such planning needs to be done in cooperation with and with the full involvement of the institutions so that whether they are happy about it or not they at least understand why and are not taken by surprise.

Second, and closely related, the total postsecondary educational resources in the state need to be taken into account in the planning process -- public, private and proprietary. This admittedly will be difficult, particularly for governing boards. A number of states have, however, taken steps in this direction and unless all sectors are involved and are willing to accept some responsibility for such review the end result is likely to be penalizing one system to the advantage of the others or reinforcing one system at the expense of the others and effective utili-

zation of resources to meet the postsecondary education needs of students will not be accomplished.

Third, far more attention will have to be paid to relating expenditures to outcomes, to performance audit. Again unless state higher or post-secondary educational agencies are willing to move in this direction themselves others will do it for them. For the health and integrity of the postsecondary educational community it is critically important that the criteria for such audit be developed by the postsecondary education community. The demand for assurance of minimal competency, currently a major issue in elementary-secondary education, will in one form or another impact the higher education community as well. Legislators, governors, students and the public are and will be increasingly concerned not only with the efficient but with the educationally effective use of funds. The general answer that education is a good thing is no longer adequate. They want to know how, in what ways, and for whom.

Fourth, the nature of the budgeting process will need to be thoroughly reviewed and formulas reexamined in terms of their adequacy to deal with problems of contraction. Enrollment driven formulas may be wholly inadequate under such conditions. We may need to look at such factors as fixed and variable costs and marginal utility in relation to program costs. Coordinating and governing agencies may need to work much more closely with state budget officers and legislative budget analysts in attemptiong to bring more effective common coordination in the budgeting process, at least to the point of agreeing on conversion factors. Further, budgeting in many states needs to be much more closely related to the planning process and vice versa.

Fifth, while it is not the function of coordinating or governing boards or institutions to set other state priorities, it is important for such agencies and institutions to become aware of what these other priorities are and the way in which such priorities complement or conflict with those in postsecondary education. This is particularly the case in relation to elementary-secondary education. One of the major problems in the near future may well be competition for funds within the education community between elementary-secondary and postsecondary education. Some common planning between the two is increasingly essential.

Sixth, of growing importance now is effective statewide and interstate-regional planning for adult and continuing education and lifelong learning. This has already become a competitive battleground. The Mondale Amendment in the Amendments of 1976 has made lifelong learning (whatever it is) a national priority. As suggested earlier if traditional colleges think that older students are going to fill the gap left by declining 18-to-24-year-olds they may be sadly disappointed. But unless some effective planning takes place now both the older students and the institutions are likely to be disappointed and the chaos that presently prevails in some states is likely to get worse.

Seventh, whether or not state coordinating or governing boards are directly involved in the collective bargaining process, it is essential that they be fully aware of it, of what is being bargained for and of the impact of bargaining on statewide planning, program review and financing.

Eighth, whether or not the federal agencies responsible for programs effecting the states get together, it is critical that state coordinating

or governing boards not only fully understand state implications of federal programs but that at the state level these be looked at and planned for in relation to each other and state priorities. It is also important in cooperation with national and state organizations such as the State Higher Education Executive Officers and the Education Commission of the States to work to insure that the states' concerns are made clear to national legislators.

Finally, and fundamentally, it is of basic importance that the lines of communication between coordinating and/or governing agencies not only with their institutions but also with legislative and executive branches of state government be kept open. Recognizing the importance of the latter is not to politicize higher or postsecondary education but to enable legislators, governors, state higher or postsecondary education agencies to work more effectively with each other to meet the critical problems ahead. Formal hearings along are inadequate to deal with the complex issues involved. The communication should be two-way and continuous. Only if this occurs can the confidence essential to effective operation be built.

To the question, can existing coordinating and/or governing boards deal with these changing responsibilities and the complex issues that lie ahead, it seems to me that the answer has to be that some of them can and some of them, without modifying their functions and powers will not be able to. Purely advisory coordination may soon join voluntary coordination on a statewide level as a thing of the past. The alternatives today appear to be relatively strong or regulatory coordination, consolidated governance or direct legislative and/or executive intervention. If the latter is to be avoided, then the roles not only of the executive but of the academic and fiscal officers of statewide boards are going to

become both more difficult and more crucial. On how effectively they can work not only with their own boards but with the institutions, the executive and legislative branches of state government and the public may well depend on the future and the integrity of postsecondary and higher education in this country.

The issues with which you are dealing in this seminar are basic and need continued discussion, analysis and implementation which extend far beyond these three days. If challenge is what you thrive on you should thrive mightily, if occassionally shortly. The one thing I would urge, however, is that in dealing with particular issues you not lose sight of the wider context which makes these issues not just technical concerns but the substance of the future of higher and postsecondary education for the decade ahead.

Speech by Dr. Richard M. Millard for the Inservice Education Project Seminar on Academic Affairs for State Level Officers. Held July 18-20, 1977 in Keystone, Colorado.

Appendix D

OTHER PAPERS

The following papers presented at the seminar, mentioned in the Proceedings, are available, on request, from the Inservice Education Program Office of the Education Commission of the States:

1. Barak, Robert J., and Robert O. Berdahl. State-Level Academic Program Review in Higher Education.

2. Caruthers, J. Kent, and Melvin D. Orwig. Analytic and Informational Support for State-Level Academic Planning.

3. Dresch, Stephen P. Higher Education: External and Internal Dynamics of Growth and Decline.

4. Folger, John K. Notes on Academic Planning.

The following paper is part of a monograph entitled: Nova University's Three National Doctoral Degree Programs: An Analysis and Formative Evaluation, By Earl Hughes, et al. A copy of the monograph can be obtained from: Behavioral Sciences Center, Nova University, College Avenue, Fort Lauderdale, Florida 33314.

5. Nelson, Fred A., and William A. Kaplin. Legal and Political Constraints on Nova University's External Degree Programs.

Appendix E

LIST OF ATTENDEES

Peggy Anet
Associate Coordinator/Statewide Planning
Council for Postsecondary Education
908 East Fifth Street
Olympia, Washington 98504

Keith Asplin
Director of Academic Affairs
Colorado Commission on Higher Education
719 State Services Building
Denver, Colorado 80203

Robert J. Barak
Director
Research & Information
State Board of Regents
Grimes State Office Building
Des Moines, Iowa 50319

Roger Bassett
Senior Staff Associate
National Center for Higher Education
Management Systems
Post Office Drawer "P"
Boulder, Colorado 80302

Robert O. Berdahl
Professor & Chairperson
Department of Higher Education
479 Christopher Baldy Hall
State University of New York
Buffalo, New York 14260

Bert R. Biles
Director
Center for Faculty Evaluation and
Development in Higher Education
1627 Anderson Box 3000
Manhattan, Kansas 66502

E. Grady Bogue
Associate Director for Academic Affairs
Tennessee Higher Education Commission
501 Union Building, Suite 300
Nashville, Tennessee 37219

George Bonham
Editor-in-Chief
CHANGE Magazine
NBW Tower
New Rochelle, New York 10801

Frank M. Bowen
Research Specialist
Institute for Governmental Studies
University of California
Berkeley, California 94720

Kenneth Brooks
Director
Academic Research & Consultant Service
Post Office Box 8251
Portland, Maine 04104

Patrick M. Callan
Executive Director
Council for Postsecondary Education
908 East Fifth Street
Olympia, Washington 98504

William D. Carr
Associate Director for Academic Affairs
Alabama Commission on Higher Education
Union Bank Building, Suite 1504
60 Commerce Street
Montgomery, Alabama 36104

Robert E. Carter
Associate Director for Programs
and Planning
Kentucky Council on Public Higher
Education
Capital Plaza Office Tower
Frankfort, Kentucky 40601

Kent Caruthers
Senior Staff Associate
National Center for Higher Education
Management Systems
Post Office Drawer "P"
Boulder, Colorado 80302

Robert J. Casey
Academic & Desegregation Analyst
Tennessee Higher Education Commission
501 Union Building, Suite 300
Nashville, Tennessee 37219

Gary Chamberlin
Associate Director
Department of Higher Education
1301 West 7th Street
Little Rock, Arkansas 72201

Glenn R. Church
Program Review Officer
Universities Grants Commission
11-395 Berry Street
Winnipeg, Manitoba, Canada R3J 1N6

John J. Conard
Executive Officer
Board of Regents
Merchants National Bank Tower
800 Jackson, #1416
Topeka, Kansas 66612

Byron P. Connell
Chief, Bureau of Postsecondary Planning
State Education Department
99 Washington Avenue, Room 1911
Albany, New York 12230

M. Olin Cook
Executive Director
Department of Higher Education
1301 West 7th Street
Little Rock, Arkansas 72116

Robert F. Corcoran
Associate Director/Postsecondary
Education Division
Education Commission of the States
1860 Lincoln Street, Suite 300
Denver, Colorado 80295

William Coulter
Vice Chancellor of Administration
Board of Regents
State Office Tower, 36th Floor
30 East Broad Street
Columbus, Ohio 43215

Kerry Davidson
Assistant Commissioner for Academic
Affairs
Louisiana Board of Regents
1530 One American Place
Baton Rouge, Louisiana 70825

Irving E. Dayton
Deputy Commissioner for Academic
Affairs
Montana University System
33 South Last Chance Gulch
Helena, Montana 59601

Donald P. Draine
Assistant Executive Director for
Academic Planning
Capitol Square Building, Suite 400
550 Cedar Street
St. Paul, Minnesota 55101

Stephen Dresch
President
Institute for Demographic & Economic
Studies, Yale
155 Whitney Avenue, Room 214
New Haven, Connecticut 06510

Alan D. Ferguson
Executive Director
New England Board of Higher Education
40 Grove Street
Wellesley, Massachusetts 02181

Kenneth Fischer
Director, Postsecondary Education
Convening Authority
Institute for Educational Leadership
1001 Connecticut Avenue, Suite 310
Washington, D. C. 20036

John K. Folger
Coordinator for Policy Analysis
Education Commission of the States
1860 Lincoln Street, Suite 300
Denver, Colorado 80295

F. Gordon Foster
Associate Commissioner for Academic
Affairs
State Board of Regents
State Office Building #3
Pierre, South Dakota 57501

Michael J. Gardone, Jr.
Coordinator of Academic Programs
Kentucky Council on Public Higher
Education
Capital Plaza Office Tower
Frankfort, Kentucky 40601

Charles I. Griffith
Director, State Planning Commission
Program
USOE
400 Maryland Avenue, S. W.
Washington, D. C. 20202

Gwen Gurley
Project Secretary
Inservice Education Program
Education Commission of the States
1860 Lincoln Street, Suite 300
Denver, Colorado 80295

Emily Hannah
Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs
Minnesota State University System
407 Capitol Square Building
550 Cedar Street
St. Paul, Minnesota 55101

Warren G. Hill
Executive Director
Education Commission of the States
1860 Lincoln Street, Suite 300
Denver, Colorado 80295

Dan S. Hobbs
Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs
Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education
500 Education Building
State Capitol Complex
Oklahoma City, Oklahoma 73105

Harriet E. Hollande
Director of Counseling
Skidmore College
99 Washington Avenue
Albany, New York 12230

T. Edward Hollander
Deputy Commissioner
Board of Regents, University of the State of New York
State Education Department
Albany, New York 12224

James Hollowood
Student
Harvard University
31 Springfield Street
Belmont, Massachusetts 02178

Sandra Cheldin Inglis
Policy Intern
Ohio Board of Regents
State Office Tower, 36th Floor
30 East Broad Street
Columbus, Ohio 43215

Robert W. Jacob
Assistant Commissioner for Academic Affairs
Department of Higher Education
600 Clark Avenue
Jefferson City, Missouri 65101

Elizabeth Johnson
Member
Oregon Educational Coordinating Commission
Post Office Box 356
Redmond, Oregon 97756

Richard Jonsen
Project Director
Statewide Policy and Independent Higher Education Project
Education Commission of the States
1860 Lincoln Street, Suite 300
Denver, Colorado 80295

Jay Kahn
Assistant Director for Academic Affairs
Illinois Board of Higher Education
4 West Old Capitol Square
Springfield, Illinois 62701

William Lannan
Director of Special Projects
Office of Commissioner of Higher Education
33 South Last Chance Gulch
Helena, Montana 59601

Thurston E. Manning
Director, Commission on Institutions of Higher Education
North Central Association of Colleges and Schools
1221 University Avenue
Boulder, Colorado 80302

Marilyn McCoy
Senior Staff Associate
National Center for Higher Education Management Systems
Post Office Drawer "P"
Boulder, Colorado 80302

Joe McFarland
Academic Officer
Kansas Board of Regents
1416 Merchants National Bank Tower
Topeka, Kansas 66612

Richard J. Meisinger, Jr.
Coordinator of Academic Programs
Council of Higher Education for Virginia
700 Fidelity Building, 9th and Main Streets
Richmond, Virginia 23219

Barbara Mickey
Associate Vice President and Dean of Academic Affairs
University of Northern Colorado
Greeley, Colorado 80639

Richard M. Millard
Director
Postsecondary Education Division
Education Commission of the States
1860 Lincoln Street, Suite 300
Denver, Colorado 80295

Jerry W. Miller
Director
Office on Educational Credit
American Council on Education
One Dupont Circle, Suite 20
Washington, D. C. 20036

E. Marilyn Mohan
Research Consultant
Universities Council of British Columbia
805 W. Broadway, Suite 500
Vancouver, British Columbia, Canada

Curtis J. Morris
Special Assistant to the Commissioner
Board of Regents for Education
199 Promenade Street, Suite 208
Providence, Rhode Island 02908

Jane Muller
Research Assistant, Postsecondary Education Division
Education Commission of the States
1860 Lincoln Street, Suite 300
Denver, Colorado 80295

Fred A. Nelson
Vice President for External Affairs
Nova University
College Avenue
Fort Lauderdale, Florida 33314

Suzanne Ness
Assistant to Executive Coordinator
Council for Postsecondary Education
908 East Fifth Street
Olympia, Washington 98504

Kenneth B. O'Brien
Associate Director
California Postsecondary Education Commission
1020 - 12th Street
Sacramento, California 95814

Melvin D. Orwig
Associate Director
National Center for Higher Education Management Systems
Post Office Drawer "P"
Boulder, Colorado 80302

Keith Pailthorp
Associate Coordinator
Council for Postsecondary Education
908 East Fifth Street
Olympia, Washington 98504

Lewis D. Patterson
Executive Director
Council for Interinstitutional Leadership
8606 Jones Mill Road
Washington, D.C. 20015

William B. Phillips
Academic Planning Coordinator
Arizona Board of Regents
1535 West Jefferson, Suite 121
Phoenix, Arizona

Van Derdonckt Pierre
Secretary - Council of Universities
2700 Boulevard Laurier
Ste-Foy, Quebec (?0)

Amy Plumer
Cooperating Editor
473 West End Avenue
Apartment 7A
New York, New York 10024

John F. Porter
Executive Director
Commission on Higher Education
600 Commerce Street, Suite 1504
Union Bank Towers
Montgomery, Alabama 36104

Matthew J. Quinn
Director
State College Office
Department of Higher Education
225 West State Street
Post Office Box 1293
Trenton, New Jersey 08625

Louis Rabineau
Project Director
Inservice Education Program
Education Commission of the States
1860 Lincoln Street, Suite 300
Denver, Colorado 80295

Kenneth E. Raschke
Commission of Higher Education
Board of Higher Education
State Capitol, 10th Floor
Bismarck, North Dakota 58505

Robert E. Rhodes
Academic Coordinator
Board of Educational Finance
Room 201, Legislative Executive Building
Santa Fe, New Mexico 87503

Alvin Rivera
Special Assistant to the Deputy
Assistant Secretary for Education
Department of Health, Education and
Welfare
200 Independence Avenue, S.W., Room 309-G
Washington, D.C. 20201

Jane Ryland
Project Director
State Higher Education Executive Officers
737 29th Street
Boulder, Colorado 80303

Frank A. Schmidtlein
Director of Research, Planning &
Evaluation
State Board of Higher Education
93 Main Street
Annapolis, Maryland 21401

Phillip Sirotkin
Executive Director
Western Interstate Commission for
Higher Education
Post Office Drawer "P"
Boulder, Colorado 80302

Steven H. Smartt
Staff Associate
Southern Regional Education Board
130 Sixth Street, NW
Atlanta, Georgia 30313

Jim Sullivan
Vice President
National Association of Independent
Colleges & Universities
1717 Massachusetts Avenue, Suite 503
Washington, D. C. 20036

Melvin R. Todd
Programs and Standards Officer
Oklahoma State Regents for Higher
Education
500 Education Building
State Capitol Complex
Oklahoma City, Oklahoma 73105

David Trivett
Research Associate
ERIC Clearinghouse on Higher Education
One Dupont Circle, Suite 630
Washington, D.C. 20036

Clifford M. Trump
Deputy Director for Academic Planning
Office of the State Board of Education
650 West State Street
Boise, Idaho 83720

Neil D. Uhlman
Associate Coordinator/Vocational-Technical
Programs
Council for Postsecondary Education
908 East Fifth Street
Olympia, Washington 98504

Joyce Walker
Assistant Director
Department of Communications
Education Commission of the States
1860 Lincoln Street, Suite 300
Denver, Colorado 80295

John C. Wright
Vice Chancellor and Director for
Academic Affairs
West Virginia Board of Regents
950 Kanawha Boulevard, East
Charleston, West Virginia 25301

Diane K. Youn
Associate in Higher Education
Program Planning
Connecticut Commission for Higher
Education
340 Capitol Avenue
Hartford, Connecticut 06101